arXiv:1704.02062v1 [q-bio.PE] 7 Apr 2017

TREE-BASED UNROOTED PHYLOGENETIC NETWORKS

ANDREW FRANCIS, KATHARINA HUBER, VINCENT MOULTON

Abstract. Phylogenetic networks are a generalization of phylogenetic trees that are used to represent non-tree-like evolutionary histories that arise in organisms such as plants and bacteria, or uncertainty in evolutionary histories. An *unrooted* phylogenetic network on a finite set X of taxa, or *network*, is a connected graph in which every vertex has degree 1 or 3 and whose leaf-set is X. It is called a *phylogenetic tree* if the underlying graph is a tree. In this paper we consider properties of *tree-based networks*, that is, networks that can be constructed by adding edges into a phylogenetic tree. We show that although they have some properties in common with their rooted analogues which have recently drawn much attention in the literature, they have some striking differences in terms of both their structural and computational properties.

Keywords: Phylogenetic tree, Phylogenetic network, Tree-based network, Hamiltonian path

1. Introduction

Let X be a finite set with $|X| \geq 1$. An *unrooted phylogenetic network N (on X)* (or *network N (on X)* for short) is a connected graph (V, E) with $X \subseteq V$, every vertex has degree 1 or 3, and each degree 1 vertex (or *leaf*) is contained in X. A *phylogenetic tree* on X is a network which is also a tree. Phylogenetic trees and networks are commonly used by biologists to represent the evolution of species; in this setting the set X usually denotes a collection of species. Networks have interesting mathematical and computational properties (see e.g. [7, 5, 16]), and they can be generated from biological data using software packages such as T-REX [13] and Splitstree [8]. In addition, networks have been used to study the genome fusion origin of eukaryotes [14] and as a tool in biogeography studies [12].



Figure 1. A tree-based network that has been constructed from a phylogenetic tree with leaf-set $\{a, b, \ldots, g\}$ by adding in 3 edges (in grey). Note that the tree is also a spanning tree for the network.

Date: April 10, 2017.

The T-REX software constructs networks (also called reticulograms) by adding edges into a phylogenetic tree [13] (see e.g. Figure 1). Using this approach, many different networks can be constructed from starting with the collection of all phylogenetic trees. However, it is not possible to construct every possible network in this manner (see for example Figure 3 below). Indeed, the networks that can be constructed in this way are of precisely the following type (cf. [2]).

Definition 1. *A network is* tree-based (on X) *if there is a spanning tree in N whose leaf-set is equal to X.*

Note that in the following we call any spanning tree in N with leaf-set X a *support-tree (for N).*

Recently, a great deal of interest has been generated concerning rooted tree-based networks. These are leaf-labelled networks whose underlying graph is a directed acyclic graph with a single root which can be constructed from a rooted phylogenetic tree by adding in extra arcs (see Section 4 for precise definitions). In particular, rooted tree-based networks were introduced in [3] and their structural properties have been studied in [2, 6, 11, 15, 17]. In addition, various computational properties of these networks have been considered [1, 3].

Here we present various results concerning tree-based networks. As we shall see, although tree-based networks have certain properties in common with their rooted analogues, they can behave quite differently both in terms of their structural and computational properties.

2. Decomposing tree-based networks

We begin by showing that networks can be decomposed into simpler pieces, which can then be used to deduce properties of the full network. Note that decomposition results have also been proven for rooted tree-based networks, although these are quite different in nature (see e.g. [17]).

We begin by presenting some definitions. A *cut-edge*, or *bridge*, of a network is an edge whose removal disconnects the graph. A cut-edge is *trivial* if one of the connected components induced by deleting the cut-edge is a vertex (which must necessarily be a leaf). A *simple* network is one all of whose cut-edges are trivial (so for instance, note that trees on more than 3 leaves are *not* simple networks). A *blob* in a network is a maximal subgraph that has no cut-edge, and that is not a vertex [5]. For example, the network in Figure 1 contains one non-trivial cut-edge and two blobs.

Now, given a network N and a blob B in N, we define a simple network B_N by taking the union of B and all cut-edges in N incident with B (the leaf-set of B_N is just the set of end vertices of these cut-edges that are not already a vertex in B).

Proposition 2. *Suppose N is a network. Then N is tree-based if and only if B_N is tree-based for every blob B in N.*

Proof: If N is tree-based, then it contains a support-tree T. Since every cut-edge in N must be contained in a support-tree, it follows that if B is a blob in N then T must induce a spanning tree of B_N that contains every vertex in B_N. Therefore B_N is tree-based.

Conversely, if B_N is tree-based for every blob B in N, then by taking a support-tree in B_N for each blob B in N, we can clearly construct a spanning tree for N

that contains all vertices in N. Therefore N is tree-based. ∎

Using the last result, we can immediately classify the tree-based networks having a single leaf.

Observation 3. *Suppose N is a network on $\{x\}$. Then N is tree-based if and only if $N = (\{x\}, \emptyset)$.*

We now look in more detail at the cut-edges of a tree-based network. A *split* of X is a bipartition of X. If we remove a cut-edge from a network, then in some cases the two resulting graphs will induce a split of X. We now show that if N is tree-based, then this is always the case.

Lemma 4. *If N is a tree-based network, then every cut-edge of N induces a split of X.*

Proof: If we have a cut-edge of N that does not induce a split of X, then it follows that there must be some blob B in N such that B_N is a network with one leaf. But then B_N is not tree-based by Observation 3. This is a contradiction by Proposition 2. ∎

We call a network N *proper* if every cut-edge induces a split of X. By Lemma 4, all tree-based networks are proper.

Interestingly, using Proposition 2, we are able to now show that certain low complexity proper networks are always tree-based. We first make a useful observation.

Lemma 5. *Let N be a network on X with $|X| \geq 2$. For any $x \in X$ let $N - x$ denote the network obtained from N by deleting x and its incident edge, and suppressing the resulting degree 2 vertex. If $N - x$ is tree-based, then so is N.*

Proof: Suppose $x \in X$ and T is a support-tree for $N - x$. Let $v \in V(N)$ denote the vertex adjacent with x that was suppressed in the construction of $N - x$ and let $e \in E(N - x)$ denote the resulting edge in $N - x$. If $e \in E(T)$, then we can obtain a support-tree for N by subdividing e with a new vertex w and adding the edge $\{w, x\}$ to T. If $e \notin E(T)$, then, since T is a support tree for $N - x$, T must contain both vertices in e, say v_1 and v_2. Therefore, we can obtain a support tree for N by adding a new vertex w and the edges $\{v_1, w\}$ and $\{w, x\}$ (or indeed $\{v_2, w\}$ and $\{w, x\}$) to T. ∎

Suppose N is a network on X and $k \geq 0$ is an integer. Then N is called a *level-k network* if at most k edges have to be removed from each blob of N to obtain a tree with leaf-set X. For example, the network in Figure 1 is a level-2 network.

Theorem 6. *If N is a proper level-4 network, then N is tree-based.*

Proof: Note first that since N is a proper network on X it must contain at least two leaves. Also note that the theorem is straight-forward to check in case N is level-0 or level-1.

In case N has level $2 \leq k \leq 4$, since N is proper, by Proposition 2 it suffices to prove that every simple, level-4 network with two leaves is tree-based. This is because we can decompose N into a collection of simple networks B_N (one for each blob B of N) each having at least 2 leaves, and if each of these simple networks is tree-based, then so is N. Moreover, for each of these simple networks B_N, if

we remove all but 2 leaves from B_N and obtain a tree-based network, then it is straight-forward to see using Lemma 5 that B_N must have been tree-based.

Now, to see that any simple, level-4 network with two leaves x and y is tree-based, we begin with the case $k = 2$. It is known that any simple level-2 network on some non-empty set Y can be obtained by inserting pendant edges in the multigraph at the top of Figure 2(i) and labelling the leaves by the elements of Y (see e.g. [10, Figure 4]). It is now straight-forward to check that, up to isomorphism, the only possible simple level-2 network on $\{x, y\}$ is isomorphic to the one at the bottom of Figure 2(i). Clearly, this network is tree-based.

We now consider the case $k = 3$. As before, it is known that any simple level-3 network on some finite set Y can be obtained by inserting a pendant edge into one of the multigraphs in Figure 2(ii) and labelling the leaves by the elements of Y ([10, Figure 4]). It is now straight-forward to check that the only possible simple level-3 networks on $\{x, y\}$ are isomorphic to one of the networks in Figure 2(iii), and that each of these is tree-based.

The proof of the case $k = 4$ is similar, and uses the fact that any simple level-4 network can be obtained from one of the five possible multigraphs as pictured in [10, Figure 4]. As there are several cases to consider, we omit the details. ∎

Remark 7. *The simple level-6 network in Figure 3 is not tree-based (this is easy to check or can be seen using Lemma 8 in the next section). It would be interesting to know whether or not all proper level-5 networks are tree-based.*



FIGURE 2. Diagram for proving that simple level-2 and level-3 networks are tree-based used in the proof of Theorem 2.

3. Recognizing tree-based networks

We now consider the computational problem of deciding whether or not a given network N is tree-based.

We begin with a useful result. Suppose that C is a cubic graph. Pick some edge e in C. Introduce two pendant edges into e containing the new degree 1 vertices x and y. This new graph $C_e(x, y)$ is a network on $\{x, y\}$. We illustrate this construction in Figure 4.

The following observation is straight-forward to check.



FIGURE 3. A simple level-6 network.



FIGURE 4. (i) Cubic graph C with edge e indicated. (ii) The network $C_e(x, y)$.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that C is a cubic graph. The following statements are equivalent:*
(i) C is Hamiltonian.
(ii) There is some edge e in C such that the network $C_e(x, y)$ is tree-based.
(iii) There is some edge e in C such that the network $C_e(x, y)$ has a support-tree consisting of a path with end vertices x and y.

Note that using this lemma it immediately follows that the network in Figure 3 is not tree-based, since if P is the Petersen graph (which is not Hamiltonian), then this network is of the form $P_e(x, y)$ for some edge e of P.

We now use the last lemma to prove two NP-completeness results. We shall also use the fact that it is NP-complete to decide if a planar, cubic, 3-connected graph is Hamiltonian [4].

Unroooted tree-based
Instance: Network N on X.
Question: Is N tree-based?

Theorem 9. *The problem* Unrooted tree-based *is NP-complete.*

Proof: Suppose that there is an algorithm that is polynomial in the size of $V(N)$ to decide whether or not a network N is tree-based.

Let C be a planar, cubic, 3-connected graph. Pick some edge e in C. Then we can check in polynomial time in $|V(C_e(x, y))| = |V(C)| + 4$ whether or not the network $C_e(x, y)$ is tree-based. Since the number of edges in C is equal to $3|V(C)|/2$, by Lemma 8(ii) it follows that we can check in polynomial time in $|V(C)|$ whether or

not C is Hamiltonian, a contradiction. ∎

Interestingly, the analogous decision problem to *Unrooted tree-based* for rooted phylogenetic networks can be decided in polynomial time [3].

We now prove that a related decision problem is NP-complete. We say that a phylogenetic tree T on X is *displayed* by a network N on X if T can be obtained from a subtree T' of N by suppressing all degree 2 vertices in T' [9]. In addition, we say that T *is a base-tree of* N or N *is based on* T if T can be obtained in this way from a support tree T' of N. Note that a phylogenetic tree may be displayed by a network but not be a support-tree for the network. For example, the phylogenetic tree consisting of an edge with leaves x, y is displayed by the network in Figure 3 (e.g consider the path of length 3 in the network between x and y) but it is not a support-tree for that network.

We now consider the following decision problem.

Unrooted base-tree containment
Instance: Network N on X and a phylogenetic tree T on X.
Question: Is N based on T?

Note that the analogous version of this decision problem for rooted phylogenetic networks is NP-complete [1]. We now show that this is also the case for networks.

Theorem 10. *The problem* Unrooted base-tree containment *is NP-complete.*

Proof: Let C be a planar, cubic, 3-connected graph.

If we could check *Unrooted base-tree containment* in polynomial time then, for each edge e in C, we could check in polynomial time whether or not the phylogenetic tree T consisting of a single edge with leaf-set $\{x, y\}$ is a base-tree for the network $C_e(x, y)$. But clearly T is a base-tree for $C_e(x, y)$ if and only if $C_e(x, y)$ is tree-based. Hence, since the number of edges in C is equal to $3|V(C)|/2$, by Lemma 8(iii) we could check in polynomial time whether or not C is Hamiltonian, a contradiction. ∎

Note that it is also NP-complete to decide whether or not a network N displays a phylogenetic tree T [9].

4. Universal tree-based networks

In this section we shall show that there are networks on X which can have *every* phylogenetic tree on X as a base-tree. To prove this we will relate networks with rooted phylogenetic networks, which we now formally define.

A *rooted* phylogenetic network M (on X) is a directed acyclic graph with a single root (vertex with indegree 0 and outdegree 2), leaf-set X (vertices with outdegree 0), and all vertices except the root having degree 1 or 3. If M is a tree, then it is called a *rooted* phylogenetic tree on X. A rooted phylogenetic network M is called *tree-based* if it contains a directed spanning tree T such that the directed edges of T are contained in the edge-set of M and the leaf set of T is X. In that case, T is called a *support tree* for M.

In [6] it is shown that for every X there exists a "universal" rooted phylogenetic network M on X, that is, M is a tree-based, rooted phylogenetic network and has every possible rooted phylogenetic tree on X as a base-tree. We shall use this result to show that there are also universal networks. First, we present a relationship between tree-based networks and rooted phylogenetic networks (cf. also [5, Section 3] for related results).

Given a network N on X with $|X| \geq 2$, a leaf $x \in X$, and some orientation o of the edges of N, we let N_o^x denote the directed graph which results by removing x and its pendant edge from N with edges oriented according to o.

Theorem 11. *Suppose that N is a network on X and $x \in X$. Then N is tree-based if and only if there exists some orientation o of the edges of N making N_o^x a tree-based (rooted) network on $X - \{x\}$.*

Proof: Suppose o is an orientation of the edges of N such that N_o^x is a tree-based, rooted network on $X - \{x\}$. Pick some base-tree T in N_o^x. Let v_x denote the vertex in N that is adjacent with x and let $v_1 \in V(N)$ denote one of the two other vertices in N adjacent with v_x. Then $v_1 \in V(T)$. Let T' be the tree obtained from T by first adding x to its leaf set, v_x to its vertex set, and $\{v_x, x\}$ and $\{v_1, v_x\}$ to its edge set and then ignoring the directions of the edges of T. Since T is a spanning tree of N_o^x with leaf set $X - \{x\}$, we clearly have that T' is a spanning tree for N with leaf set X. Thus, N is tree-based.

Conversely, suppose that N is tree-based. Pick some support-tree T in N and orient all edges in T away from x. Let $x, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m$ be some topological ordering of the vertices in T (i. e. an ordering that is consistent with the partial ordering induced by T). For each vertex v in T that is the end vertex of some edge in N not in T, starting with a vertex that comes earliest in the ordering, direct the edge away from v, and if such an edge is encountered that has already been directed, then ignore this. This choice o of orientations of the edges of N implies that N_o^x is a rooted phylogenetic network on $X - x$ (since it has no directed cycles) with support-tree $T_{o'}^x$ where o' is the orientation of the edges induced by o. ∎

Corollary 12. *Suppose $|X| \geq 1$. Then there exists a tree-based network N on X such that every phylogenetic tree T on X is a base-tree for N.*

Proof: The case $|X| = 1$ and $|X| = 2$ are obvious. Assume $|X| \geq 3$. Let $x \in X$ and set $Y = X - \{x\}$. Let M be a universal rooted network on Y (see [6] for details). Let ρ denote the root of M. Let N be the network on X obtained by adding x to the leaf set of M, a new vertex r to the vertex sert of N, new edges $\{r, x\}$ and $\{r, \rho\}$ to M, and ignoring the orientations of all edges of M. Clearly, N is a network on X and M and N_o^x are isomorphic where o is the orientation of the edges of M. By Theorem 11, N is tree-based. Moreover, if T is any rooted phylogenetic tree on Y then T is a base-tree for M because M is a universal network on Y. Hence, the tree T_x obtained by adjoining the element x as a leaf to the root of T is a phylogenetic tree on X and ignoring its edge orientations renders it a base-tree for N. But it is straight-forward to check that the set

$$\{T_x : x \in X \text{ and } T \text{ a rooted phylogenetic tree on } X - \{x\}\}$$

is equal to the set of phylogenetic trees on X. The corollary follows immediately. ∎

5. Fully tree-based networks

In [15] a characterization of rooted phylogenetic networks in which every embedded phylogenetic tree with the same leaf-set is a base-tree is given (these are precisely the "tree-child" networks). In our last result, we will characterize networks that have an analogous property.

Note that a network N on X always contains a subtree with the same leaf-set as N. For example, if we fix some $x \in X$ and let p_{xy} be some path in N for all $y \in X - \{x\}$, then the tree obtained by removing (if necessary) a minimum number of edges from the union of the paths p_{xy} over all $y \in X - \{x\}$ is a subtree of N with leaf-set X.

We call a network N on X *fully tree-based* if every subtree of N with leaf-set X is a support-tree for N. Note that by the previous remark, any fully tree-based network is tree-based.

Lemma 13. *Suppose that N is a simple, tree-based network and that T is a base-tree for N. If $e = \{v_1, v\}, e' = \{v, v_2\}$ are incident edges in T such that neither e nor e' are pendant edges of T, and T_e and $T_{e'}$ are the trees which are obtained by deleting e and e', respectively, that do not contain v, then there must exist some edge e'' in N which has one vertex in T_e and the other in $T_{e'}$.*

Proof: Suppose that there is no edge e'' with the stated properties. Then there exists only one path in N between v_1 and v_2. But this contradicts the fact that N is simple, and therefore the graph N with all pendant edges removed is 2-connected. ∎

Lemma 14. *Suppose that N is a simple, level-k network, $k \geq 1$, on X, $|X| \geq 2$. Then N contains a vertex which is not contained in a pendant edge of N if and only if $k \geq 2$.*

Proof: Since N is simple, $|V(N)| = 2(|X| - 1 + k)$ (cf. e.g. [7]). Now, let q be the number of vertices in N which are not contained in any pendant edge of N. Then clearly

$$|V(N)| = 2|X| + q.$$

Therefore, $q = 2k - 2$. The lemma now follows immediately. ∎

We now characterize fully tree-based networks. Note that these are significantly less complicated than the tree-child networks mentioned above.

Theorem 15. *Suppose that N is a network on X. Then N is fully tree-based if and only if N is a level-1 network.*

Proof: The statement is clearly true if $|X| = 1$. So we assume from now on that $|X| \geq 2$.

By Proposition 2, it suffices to assume that N is simple.

If N is a simple, level-1 network, then it is straight-forward to check that it is fully tree-based.

Conversely, suppose for contradiction that N is a simple network on X which has level at least 2, and that N is fully tree-based. Let T be a support-tree for N.

Suppose that v is a vertex in T that is not contained in some pendant edge of N. Note that such a vertex exists by Lemma 14 since N has level at least 2.

If the degree of v in T is 2, then let $e = \{v_1, v\}, e' = \{v, v_2\}$ denote its incident edges neither of which can be a pendant edge in N. Then, by Lemma 13, we can remove edges e, e' from T and add in an edge $e'' \in E(N)$ in between a vertex of T_e and a vertex of $T_{e'}$ where T_e and $T_{e'}$ are as in the proof of that lemma. Since the degree of v in T is 2, the resulting tree T' has leaf set X. Moreover T' does not contain the vertex v. But this contradicts the fact that N is fully tree-based.

If the degree of v in T is 3, then let $e = \{v_1, v\}, e' = \{v, v_2\}$ be two edges incident with v. Then by Lemma 13, there is an edge e'' between a vertex of T_e and a vertex of $T_{e'}$. Now, if we remove e from T and add in edge e'' we obtain a new tree T' that is a support-tree for N and which contains a vertex (namely v) with degree 2, such that neither of the edges in T' incident with v is a pendant edge of T'. But this is impossible by the argument presented above. ∎

6. Final Remarks

We have proven various results concerning tree-based networks, and shown that they have somewhat different properties as compared with rooted tree-based networks.

The structure of rooted tree-based networks is very well understood see e.g. [2, 17]. It would be interesting to know if related structural results can be proven for tree-based networks. In addition, results have recently appeared concerning the structure of non-binary rooted, tree-based networks [11] (networks in which internal vertices do not necessarily have degree 3). It would therefore also be of interest to consider properties of non-binary tree-based networks.

Acknowledgments. KTH and VM thank the London Mathematical Society for its support and also the Centre for Research in Mathematics at Western Sydney University, Australia, where this work was first discussed. AF and VM also thank the Royal Society for its support.

References

[1] M. Anaya et al., On determining if tree-based networks contain fixed trees, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, (2016) 78(5), 961969.
[2] A. Francis, C. Semple, M. Steel, New characterisations of tree-based networks and proximity measures, arXiv:1611.04225
[3] A. Francis, M. Steel, Which phylogenetic networks are merely trees with additional arcs? *Systematic Biology* **64(5)** (2015) 768777
[4] M. Garey, D. Johnson and R. Tarjan, The planar Hamiltonian circuit problem is NP-complete, *SIAM J. Computing* **5(4)** (1976), 704-714.
[5] P. Gambette, V. Berry, C. Paul, Quartets and unrooted phylogenetic networks. *J. Bioinform. Comput. Biol.* **10(4)** (2012):1250004
[6] M. Hayamizu, On the existence of infinitely many universal tree-based networks, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **396** (2016) 204206
[7] K. T. Huber, V. Moulton, T. Wu, Transforming phylogenetic networks: Moving beyond tree space, *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **404** (2016) 30-39
[8] D. Huson, D. Bryant, Application of phylogenetic networks in evolutionary studies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **23** (2006) 254267
[9] L. van Iersel, S. Kelk, G. Stamoulis, L. Stougie, O. Boes, On unrooted and root-uncertain variants of several well-known phylogenetic network problems, arXiv:1609.00544
[10] L. van Iersel, V. Moulton, Leaf-reconstructibility of phylogenetic networks, arXiv:1701.08982

[11] L. Jetten, L. van Iersel, Nonbinary tree-based phylogenetic networks, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, in press. arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.04974
[12] P. Legendre, V. Makarenkov, Reconstruction of biogeographic and evolutionary networks using reticulograms, *Systematic Biology* **51** (2002) 199-216
[13] V. Makarenkov, T-REX: reconstructing and visualizing phylogenetic trees and reticulation networks, *Bioinformatics* **17** (2001) 664668
[14] M. Rivera, J. Lake, The ring of life provides evidence for a genome fusion origin of eukaryotes, *Nature* **431** (2004) 152155
[15] C. Semple, Phylogenetic networks with every embedded phylogenetic tree a base tree, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **78** (2016) 132137
[16] C. Semple, M. Steel, Unicyclic networks: Compatibility and enumeration, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* **3** (2006) 84-91
[17] L. Zhang, On tree-based phylogenetic networks. *Journal of Computational Biology*, **23(7)** (2016) 553565

Francis: Centre for Research in Mathematics, Western Sydney University, Australia. e-mail: A.Francis@westernsydney.edu.au

Huber, Moulton: School of Computing Sciences, University of East Anglia, UK. e-mail: k.huber@uea.ac.uk, v.moulton@uea.ac.uk